File No: A-_____

FEDERAL COURT OF APPEAL

BETWEEN:

_____

Appellant

and

HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN

Respondent

RECORD OF MOTION

1. Notice of Motion

2. Appellant's Affidavit

3. Appellant's Written Representations

For the Appellant:

Name: _____

Address: _____

_____

Tel/fax: _____

Email: _____

For the Respondent:

Attorney General for Canada

Address: _____

File No: A-_____

FEDERAL COURT OF APPEAL

BETWEEN:

_____

Appellant

and

HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN

Respondent

NOTICE OF MOTION

TAKE NOTICE THAT the Appellant's urgent motion, on short notice if applicable, will be made in writing to a judge of this Court.

THE MOTION SEEKS an interim constitutional exemption from the prohibitions on marihuana in the CDSA for the Appellant's personal medical use pending this appeal.

THE GROUNDS ARE THAT the Appellant's Right to Life will be infringed upon if Appellant's motion an Interim Constitutional Exemption for Personal Medical Use is denied.

AND FOR ANY ORDER abridging any time for service or amending any error or omission which this Honourable Court may allow.

Dated at _____ on _____ 2014.

_____

Appellant's Signature:

Name: _____

Address: _____

_____

Tel/fax: _____

Email: _____

TO: Registrar of this Court

Attorney General for Canada

File No: A-_____

FEDERAL COURT OF APPEAL

BETWEEN:

_____

Appellant

and

HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN

Respondent

NOTICE OF MOTION

For the Appellant:

Name: _____

File No: A-_____

FEDERAL COURT OF APPEAL

BETWEEN:

_____

Appellant

and

HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN

Respondent

APPELLANT'S AFFIDAVIT

I, _____, residing

at _____ make oath as follows:

1. Appellant, T-_____-14, am one of numerous Canadians asking Federal Court for a constitutional exemption to use cannabis for personal medical purposes and wish to use cannabis marijuana for the medical purpose checked:
[ ] to prevent illness it's good for before getting it; or
[ ] to alleviate suffering from the following illnesses for which I have medical documentation OR government permits; and for the chemical drugs I have been prescribed which have proven to be not as effective as cannabis for my particular treatment:

Illness:	**Drug Treatment:**
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

2. How the MMAR/MMPR impact my health and right to life:

3. If applicable, the names of physicians who refused Affiant the requested cannabis treatment with no contra-indications for its use and their non-medical reasons:

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

4. If applicable, I possess this exemption authorization:

Authorization To Possess #_____

Grams/day: _____ Plant limit: _____ Storage limit: _____

5. I filed File Number T-_____-14 Statement of Claim against Her Majesty The Queen upon the imminent threat to my Right to life by the coming into force of the MMPR on April 1 2014 for:

"A) A Declaration pursuant to s.52 (1) of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms (Charter) for an Order:
A1) that the Medical Marihuana Access Regulations (MMAR) that came into force on Jul 30 2001 and the Marihuana for Medical Purposes Regulations (MMPR) that came into force on June 19, 2013, (and run concurrently with the MMAR until March 31, 2014 when the MMAR will be repealed by the MMPR) are unconstitutional and not saved by S.1 of the Charter in that the s. 7 Charter constitutional right of a medically needy patient to reasonable access to his/her medicine by way of a safe and continuous supply consistent with the S.7 Charter right is unreasonably restricted by the impediments to access and/or supply in the MMAR and/or MMPR;

A2) and that, "absent a constitutionally acceptable medical exemption," the prohibitions on marihuana in the Controlled Drugs and Substances Act (CDSA) are invalid and the word "marijuana" be struck from Schedule II of the CDSA.
B) In the alternative, pursuant to S.24(1) of the Charter, for a permanent Personal Exemption from the prohibitions on marihuana in the CDSA for the Plaintiff's personal medical use;

C) Or, alternatively, damages for the loss of patient's marihuana, plants and/or production site and future supply needed."

4. I claimed damages to compensate for the loss of:

Stored Grams: _____ @ $15/gram or less = $_____

Plants: _____ @ $1,000/plant or less = $_____

Gr/day: _____ x ___ days since down x $15 = $_____

Production site investment = $_____

Gr/day: _____ x 365 x $15 x ____Yrs to 90 = $_____

Total: = $_____

5. Despite cannabis having no Drug Identification Number for financial support, I can afford to have my own medication produced using my own resources rather than that of a Licensed Producer; without paying any taxes. I can not afford a taxing Licensed Producer growing my medication for me.

8. This Affidavit is made in support of a motion for an interim constitutional exemption from the prohibitions on marihuana in the CDSA for the Appellant's personal medical use pending this appeal.

Sworn before me at _____ on _____

_____

Appellant Affiant Signature

_____

A COMMISSIONER, ETC.

File No: A-_____

FEDERAL COURT OF APPEAL

BETWEEN:

_____

Appellant

and

HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN

Respondent

APPELLANT'S AFFIDAVIT

For the Appellant:

Name: _____

FCA File No: A-_____

FEDERAL COURT OF APPEAL

BETWEEN:

_____

Appellant

and

HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN

Respondent

APPELLANT'S WRITTEN REPRESENTATIONS

FACTS:

1. Appellant is one of numerous Self-Rep "Turmel Kit" plaintiffs who filed a Statement of Claim in Federal Court. Of the 5 classes of Plaintiffs, I have checked that:

[ ] a) I have an Authorization to Possess ("ATP") and a Personal-Use Production License ("PUPL") under the Marijuana Medical Access Regulations ("MMAR") which were grand-fathered in the relief granted the Allard Plaintiffs (T-2030-13) by Justice Manson on Mar 21 2014;

[ ] b) I have a Grow Permit grand-fathered but my Possess permit was not;

[ ] c) I was once exempted under the MMAR;

[ ] d) I have a qualifying medical condition but was never exempted under the MMAR;

[ ] e) I do not have a qualifying medical condition.

2. Our Actions seek declaratory and financial relief for violations of rights under S. 7 of the Charter by seeking an Order:

A1) that the Medical Marihuana Access Regulations (MMAR) that came into force on Jul 30 2001 and the Marihuana for Medical Purposes Regulations (MMPR) that came into force on June 19, 2013, (and run concurrently with the MMAR until March 31, 2014 when the MMAR will be repealed by the MMPR) are unconstitutional and not saved by S.1 of the Charter in that the s. 7 Charter constitutional right of a medically needy patient to reasonable access to his/her medicine by way of a safe and continuous supply consistent with the S.7 Charter right is unreasonably restricted by the impediments to access and/or supply in the MMAR and/or MMPR;

A2) And that, "absent a constitutionally acceptable medical exemption," the prohibitions on marihuana in the Controlled Drugs and Substances Act (CDSA) are invalid and the word "marijuana" be struck from Schedule II of the CDSA.

B) In the alternative, pursuant to S.24(1) of the Charter, for a permanent Personal Exemption from prohibitions in the CDSA on marihuana for the Plaintiff's personal medical use.

C) Or, alternatively, damages for loss of patient's marihuana, plants and production site and future needs.

3. The grounds of the Action:
a) "For MMAR Repeal" are 16 identified constitutional violations,
b) "For MMPR Repeal" repeal are 20 identified constitutional violations,

c) and, absent a viable medical exemption pursuant to R. v. J.P., for repeal of the prohibitions by striking the word "marijuana" from Schedule II of the CDSA.

4. We seek to have the MMPR declared invalid because of the many fatal deficiencies to the point the regime is so full of holes, it is in effect invalidated by these 20 constitutional flaws to leave the regime in tatters:

BOTH 1) Require recalcitrant doctor;
BOTH 2) Not provide DIN (Drug Identification Number);
BOTH 3) Require annual renewals for permanent diseases;
BOTH 4) Require unused cannabis to be destroyed;
BOTH 5) Refusal or cancellation for non-medical reasons;
BOTH 6) Health Canada feedback to doctors on dosages;
BOTH 7) Not provide instantaneous online processing;
BOTH 8) Not have resources to handle large demand;
BOTH 9) Prohibit non-dried forms of cannabis; * Allard a)
BOTH 10) Not exempt from CDSA S.5.;

MMPR 11) ATP valid solely as "medical document";
MMPR 12) Licensed Producer may cancel for "business reason";
MMPR 13) Prohibit return of medical document to cancelee;
MMPR 14) Prohibit production in a dwelling; * Allard b)
MMPR 15) Prohibits outdoor production; * Allard c)
MMPR 16) Not protect rights to brand genetics;
MMPR 17) Not remove financial barriers;
MMPR 18) Not provide central registry for police check;
MMPR 19) Not enough Licensed Producers to supply demand;
MMPR 20) Prohibit processing > 150 grams. * Allard d)

5. Plaintiffs further raise 6 additional concerns with the MMAR regime added to the first 10 in common with the MMPR to have the MMAR condemned:

MMAR 11) Require a specialist consultation;
MMAR 12) Require conventional treatments be inappropriate;
MMAR 13) Prohibit more than 2 licenses/grower;
MMAR 14) Prohibit more than 4 licenses/site;
MMAR 15) Number of plants limit improper;
MMAR 16) Not allow any gardening help.

6. On Mar 10 2014, our Actions challenging the MMAR and MMPR was stayed pending the Mar 21 2014 decision of the motion for interim relief in Allard v. HMTQ [T-2030-13] challenging only the MMPR. The Allard action represents the concerns of the Coalition "Against MMAR Repeal" who have Authorizations To Possess while Applicant is "For MMAR Repeal" because of its unconstitutional violations. Such polar opposite remedies are not "substantially similar." They seek to declare the MMPR constitutionally invalid only to the extent of striking 4 minor cosmetic flaws to leave the regime constitutional:
a) prohibition on non-dried forms of cannabis, MMAR-MMPR 9).
b) prohibition on production in a dwelling; MMPR 14).
c) prohibition on outdoor production; MMPR 15).
d) prohibition on possessing and dealing more than 150g; MMPR 20);
or for extension of the MMAR and its associated privileges.

7. It is submitted the larger list of constitutional violations alleged should be addressed before those addressed in the Allard mini-list. The resolution of those 4

minor MMPR issues for those Against MMAR repeal hardly significantly narrow the 20 violations alleged against the MMPR and not narrow at all any of the 16 issues raised for MMAR repeal. Ray Turmel T-517-14 has the benefit of the Allard Injunction extending the MMAR but still faces the detriment of a 1-year mandatory minimum for growing too many plants (while under storage limit) under that same MMAR. Waiting for the resolution of the challenge of the MMPR helps not at all and not in time.

8. Plaintiff notes all the big issues that have plagued patients for the past decade have all been omitted in Allard. Plaintiff herein has raised the "Patient:Grower limit" raised in Sfetkopoulos v. HMTQ, "Growers:Garden limit" raised in R. v. Beren, "Doctors Opting Out" raised in R. v. Mernagh and R. v. Turner, "Yearly Renewals for Permanent Ill," "S.65 Destroy Order when permit late," violations that truly hamper patient access that the Allards have left out. Can the resolution of these 4 mini-torts really leave a working exemption?

9. On Mar 21 2014, Justice Manson ruled in Allard that:

A) all Production Permits grand-fathered to Oct 1 2013 were extended pending trial of the action but only those with current Authorizations To Possess Permits as of Mar 21 2014 were extended. Robert Roy's T-918-14 Possess Permit expired Mar 18 2014 while his Production Permit remained valid, no more meds by only 3 days.

B) the limit on possession should be 150 grams.

10. A) Problems with MMAR Extension when ATPs cannot:

1. change garden/storage address: Kevin Moore T-548-14 et al;

2. change outdoor to indoor; Diane T-594-14 & David Dobbs T-593-14 et al;

3. change indoor to outdoor; Darron Finn T-582-14 et al;

4. change Designated Grower: Jennifer Dobbs T-597-14 et al;

5. change dosage: Stephan Sealy T-564-14 et al.

6. document their exemption to police: Ray Turmel T-517-14.

11. B) Problem with 150 gram possession limit:

1) the limit was based on testimony that "peer-reviewed surveys" (not peer-reviewed) showed average daily use of 2 grams/day in Canada despite the actual prescribed dosage cited as 17.7 gram/day making a reasonable 30-day limit not 150 grams but a commensurate 1,350 grams, 9 times more;

2) many Plaintiffs have dosages higher than the 150 grams limit: Michael Pearce T-1106-14 260 grams/day which makes the 150 gram possession limit impossibly inconvenient;

3) any remaining supply must be destroyed at time of delivery of new supply.

12. On Apr 8 2014, Her Majesty in Default of filing a Statement of Defence filed a Notice of Motion in writing for a stay of all Actions similar to that of John Turmel T-488-

14 pending the final decision in Allard v. HMTQ (T-2030-13) on the basis that Plaintiff is "seeking relief which is substantially similar to that being sought by the Allard Plaintiffs" due to the 4 issues in common whose resolution would "significantly narrow" the issues

13. At the Apr 29 2014 hearing before Mr. Justice Phelan, it was explained to Justice Phelan how 20 violations by the MMPR are not substantially similar to the 4 violations addressed by Allard and resolving those 4 issues out of 20 could not "significantly narrow" the issues. And it was further explained how the points of concern to the ATP holders are not objectionable to those without.

14. On May 7 2014, Justice Phelan ruled:

> **UPON MOTION by the Defendant/Respondent (referred to as the Defendant) to stay all of the proceedings of the Plaintiffs/Applicants (referred to as the Plaintiffs) pending the Court's in Neil Allard et al v Her Majesty the Queen in Right of Canada (Federal Court File No T-2030-13) [Allard];**
> **AND UPON HEARING the parties at the Case Management Conference on April 29, 2014;**
> **FOR REASONS ISSUED, the motion is granted until the Court's decision on the merits of Allard, subject to the following terms:**
>
> **1(a) All Court files wherein the Plaintiff meets the criteria of the injunction in the Allard matter [the Allard Injunction] are stayed except with leave of the Court to bring any proceeding.**
> **1(b) Such Plaintiffs shall be entitled to the terms of the Allard Injunction;**

1(c) The Defendant shall by motion under Rule 369, within seven (7) days hereof, advise the Court and the relevant party as to those Plaintiffs who, in their view, are subject to the Allard Injunction.
1(d) Any Plaintiff identified by the Defendant as subject to the Allard Injunction may within ten (10) days of service of the Defendant's motion oppose the motion in accordance with Rule 369. The Defendant shall have five (5) days for reply.
1(e) Pending some other decision by the Court, those parties whom the Defendant has identified as entitled to the benefit of the Allard Injunction, shall be treated as if the Allard Injunction applies to them. A copy of the Allard Injunction is attached to this Order and incorporated mutatis mutandis.

2(a) All other Plaintiffs who have applied for interim relief may, within ten (10) days hereof, amend their pleadings including in particular their motion for interim relief to provide such additional evidence and submissions as they deem necessary.
2(b) The Defendant shall have ten (10) days to respond to such amendment and shall propose a timetable for such further steps as they consider necessary.
2(c) Pending further Order of the Court, and except with respect to their motions for interim relief, these Plaintiffs' matters are likewise stayed.

3. All other matters not provided for in paragraphs 1 and 2 are stayed subject to any party obtaining leave of the Court to bring any other related proceedings or seeking some further relief.

4. The terms of this Order shall apply to any new application or statement of claim filed subsequent to this Order which is substantially identical to those already subject to this Order.

5. The terms of this Order may be varied or amended as the Court determines necessary."

15. On May 14 2014, the Crown produced Schedule A for those who qualified for the Allard benefits and Schedule B for those who did not. Those on Schedule A now had 10 days from the production to oppose the motion and those on Schedule B had 3 days, they had to respond "within ten (10) days hereof" the May 7 decision, not hereof the May 14 list like Schedule A.

16. Many Applicants waited for the Crown's snail-mail to get the Schedules and by that time those not on Schedule A found out, their 3 days had already run out. Worse, the Crown only served the Schedules on Schedule A Applicants and did not serve them on the Schedule B Applicants so they were never even told they weren't on the Allard protected list.

17. Others did submit printed response motions to abandon the 4 Allard violations whose communality was the basis of staying the motions for interim relief and some were:

a) accepted: Daniel Dias T-587-14 et al;

b) rejected for not complying with the order to be in writing in response to the Crown's motion in writing: Henriette McIntyre T-516-14 et al;

18. Over 50 had already submitted motions with affidavits attesting to their medical need and did not amend their pleadings.

19. On July 9 2014, Justice Phelan stayed all Actions challenging the MMAR pending the final decision in the Allard challenge to the MMPR and dismissed all motions for interim exemptions for Personal Medical Use:

> **THE COURT ORDERS THAT:**
>
> **1. All Court files listed in Schedule "A" are stayed until the Court's decision on the merits of Allard for the reasons described in the May 7 order. The claimants in these files are entitled to the benefit of the Allard Injunction;**
>
> **2. All Court files listed in Schedule "B" are stayed until the Court's decision on the merits of Allard for the reasons described in the May 7 order. The claimants in these files are not entitled to the benefit of the Allard Injunction;**
>
> **3. Where a claim has been stayed, the claimant may not file any further pleading with the Court unless otherwise ordered by this Court;**
>
> **4. Every claim filed after May 7th, 2014 which is substantially identical to those subject to this order is stayed. Claimants in this group who meet the Allard requirements are entitled to the benefit of the Allard Injunction. Claimants who do not meet these requirements are not entitled to the benefit of the Allard Injunction;**

5. All motions for interim relief are dismissed without costs.

20. In the reasons for the Order, Justice Phelan wrote:

[29] The Court notes that the claimants were given an opportunity to remedy certain deficiencies in their motions materials following the May 7th order; no claimant took advantage of that opportunity.

21. Actually, several claimants took the opportunity to file or try to file a response to remedy their motion by abandoning the Allard communalities and providing more medical evidence. No reasons are given for the dismissing the motion to abandon the Allard communalities before all actions were stayed for those communalities that were not allowed to be abandoned.

22. Justice Phelan further ruled:

[28] In addition, the motions materials are inadequate to grant any relief. Although the motion record contains an affidavit portion which contains different degrees of personal information, each fails to plead sufficient evidence regarding the claimant's personal circumstances to warrant any relief. While some claimants have indicated an ATP permit number, most have failed to provide a copy of that permit or to indicate whether it was relevant on the relevant dates.

23. Applicants Affidavits attested to a valid medical need for marijuana with many having already qualified for MMAR exemption. Why would the Court need to see a copy of the ATP when it is on record. What purpose would it serve? Does the

Court really need to see the ATP, really need to see the medical file the doctor has already examined to "sufficiently show" illness when the doctor already said so? Given the Crown has not disputed any medical facts, the court should not have either. Had it been known the judge thought the doctor's authorization was insufficient proof of medical need, it could have been added. And many affidavits submitted more medical evidence.

24. Justice Phelan further ruled:

> **Perhaps most importantly, the claimants have failed to establish at this time that the medical exemption provided by the MMAR or MMPR violates their Charter rights in a way that would be remedied by the proposed constitutional exemption.**

25. Since neither the MMAR nor MMPR serve Applicant's medical need, a continued violation of the right to life remains while there is no exemption for access for Personal Medical Use. The validity of the exemption is being challenged for the same unaffordability for which the Allard Plaintiffs were granted remedy. Not being able to afford the MMPR seemed good enough reason to grant the Allards their protection, it should be good enough reason to have granted Plaintiff such exemption too.

26. Justice Phelan further ruled:

> **[21] In the Allard Injunction hearing, Justice Manson declined to issue a similar constitutional exemption. He wrote at para 124:**
>
> **"The first form of relief requested by the Applicants [a constitutional exemption] is inappropriate. It would exempt medically-approved patients and their designates**

from the possession, trafficking, and possession for the purposes of production provisions in the CDSA without qualification. This is not the intent of the MMAR, which defined the circumstances under which medically-approved patients could possess and grow marihuana and in what quantities. The relief sought would grant them exemption from the provisions of the CDSA without limitation."

[22] This Court concurs with the reasoning of Justice Manson. The constitutional exemption from the prohibitions on marihuana in the CDSA sought by the claimants (whether interim or permanent) is inappropriate. It is not tailored to remedying an alleged Charter violation, but appears essentially unlimited.

[23] The requested exemption does include an apparent limit in the form of the marihuana production and possession being "for the Plaintiff's personal medical use". As the claimants attack the MMAR and MMPR regimes in part for their reliance on doctor's prescription, it is unclear how a valid medical purpose would be established other than in the claimant's discretion.

27. Justice Manson refused constitutional exemptions to Allard because "the relief sought would grant them exemption from the provisions of the CDSA without limitation." It is submitted that "for personal medical use" is a reasonable limitation on such exemption.

28. In R. v. Parker [1997], Provincial Court Judge Sheppard granted Parker an exemption from the CDSA prohibitions on possession and cultivation of marijuana for his medical need with no dosage limit.

29. On July 31 2000, in R. v. Parker, the Ontario Court of Appeal ruled the prohibition on possession of marijuana (and cultivation prohibition had that stay been appealed) to be invalid absent a viable medical exemption. It suspended its decision 1 year and granted Parker a constitutional exemption pending the government providing him with a medical exemption with no dosage limit.

30. In 2003, Justice Moldaver ordered Health Canada to exempt Terry Parker while he was appealing.

31. Though the "apparent limit" of Personal Medical Use "appears essentially unlimited," nevertheless, it was sufficient a limit to be granted to Terry Parker on three previous occasions by the criminal courts; a Criminal Court would clearly discern that trafficking to minors could never be construed as Personal Medical Use. So if an "unlimited exemption for Personal Medical Use" without any prescribed dosage was limited enough for those courts to grant Parker his exemption, then, it should also have been limited enough for the Federal Court to grant Appellant one for Personal Medical Use now too.

32. Justice Phelan further ruled:

> **[24] The Court is aware that in R v Parker, [2000] OJ No 2787, 49 OR (3d) 481 (OCA) [Parker], the Ontario Court of Appeal granted a one-year personal constitutional exemption from the possessions offence under the CDSA to Mr. Parker for his medical needs. This was in the context of a broader order which declared the marihuana possession prohibition in section 4 of the CDSA to be invalid, and suspended the declaration of invalidity for**

a period of twelve months from the release of the decision.

[26] The facts in Parker are distinct from those at hand. In Parker, there was no exemption from the CDSA marihuana prohibition provisions. The proceedings at hand are distinct because there is an exemption in the form of the MMPR (and in grand-fathered MMAR permits for certain claimants); the claimants simply challenge the validity of this exemption.

Most importantly, the constitutional exemption was granted in Parker in conjunction with a temporary suspension of a declaration of invalidity of the provisions of the CDSA. The Court has not made such an order here.

When s. 24(1) is read in context, it becomes apparent that the intent of the framers of the Constitution was that it function primarily as a remedy for unconstitutional government acts.

33. That Plaintiff should have had an interim exemption pending the eventual declaration of invalidity seemed indicated by Judge Sheppard granting Parker an exemption from the start. An exemption was the only available remedy Judge Sheppard had without power to strike down the prohibitions. Appellant asks for such same remedy for an alleged unconstitutional government act, not yet but soon to be proven.

34. After the dismissal of the motion to abandon the Allard issues in common, many Applicants submitted new Statements of Claim with those communalities deleted which were:
a) rejected if the Plaintiff had an old Statement of Claim with the Allard communalities refused to be stricken

b) stayed for being "substantially similar" to the old Statement of Claim with the Allard Communalities.

35. Jason Allman T-1187-14 had filed an old Statement of Claim with the Allard communalities and filed a new one T-1365-14 without the common issues. Justice Phelan directed that his motion for an interim exemption for Personal Medical Use be accepted and is now under deliberation.

36. Appellant submits the Judge erred in staying the actions because of the presence of Allard communalities whose abandonment he refused to allow.

37. In the Affidavit of John Turmel, expert witness in Mathematics of Gambling, in T-488-14, it has been brought to the Court's attention that a genocidal under-medication of a whole class of patients occurred when Justice Manson's under-evaluated non-peer-reviewed limit took effect on April 1 2014. The 150 gram limit on personal possession and shipments suggested by Health Canada and imposed by Manson J. was based on false or non-existent peer-reviewed surveys that suggested no such thing and end up under-medicating the whole class by a factor of 9, thus inflicting on the group conditions of life calculated (8/9) to bring about it's physical destruction in violation of S.318(2) of the Criminal Code and is of such urgency as to warrant the expeditious attention of the Court.

38. The Allard ruling's failure to extend the MMAR makes it impossible for all who cannot afford Health Canada retail prices to get a self-grow for their own personal use, again inflicting on the group conditions of life calculated to bring about its physical destruction. It is submitted that

the whole of the population who cannot afford Health Canada's retail prices are disallowed from being able to self-produce at affordable prices and only an exemption for personal medical use is suitable remedy.

39. Given this question of genocide, and given the Ministry of Justice has had almost a month to study the statistics of the fraud, Plaintiff's only hope is for a constitutional exemption from the CDSA for Personal Medical Use.

Dated at _____ on _____ 2014.

_____
Appellant's Signature:

Name: _____
Address: _____
_____
Tel/fax: _____
Email: _____

AUTHORITIES: No Authorities relied on
REGULATIONS CITED: No regulations cited.

File No: A-_____

FEDERAL COURT OF APPEAL

BETWEEN:

_____

Appellant

and

HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN

Respondent

APPELLANT'S WRITTEN REPRESENTAIONS

For the Appellant:

Name: _____

File No: A-_____

FEDERAL COURT OF APPEAL

BETWEEN:

_____

Appellant

and

HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN

Respondent

RECORD OF MOTION

For the Appellant:

Name: _____

Address: _____

_____

Tel/fax: _____

Email: _____